



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/758,953

01/16/2004

Albert C. Brown

SVL920065008US3

6170

47069

7590

05/05/2008

KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP

ATTN: IBM54

315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210

BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

WHIPPLE, BRIAN P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/05/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/758,953	Applicant(s) BROWN ET AL.	
	Examiner Brian P. Whipple	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36,38-50 and 52-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36,38-50 and 52-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/30/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 36, 38-50, and 52-56 are pending in this application and presented for examination. Claims 1-35, 37, and 51 have been cancelled by Applicant.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/30/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are directed to cancelled claims or amended subject matter. Therefore, they are properly addressed in the prior art rejections below or have been removed (in the case of cancelled claims).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2152

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 36, 38-50, and 52-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger et al. (Challenger), submitted by the applicant (item 20 in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 8/18/04), in view of what was well known in the art, and further in view of Haverstock et al. (Haverstock), U.S. Publication No. 2002/0038357 A1.

6. As to claim 36, Challenger discloses a method for managing electronic content on a computer network, the method comprising:

storing a plurality of files in an electronic content library (Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, Fig. 6) of an enterprise content management system (Pg. 847, § B.2, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ln. 8-10; Pg. 848, Fig. 6; Fig. 7);

maintaining revision history data for at least one of the files stored in the electronic content library (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 5, ln. 8-13; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Fig. 6; Fig. 7);

publishing one or more of the files stored in the electronic content library using a web content manager linked to the enterprise content management system, wherein the web content manager is configured to manage information available on a website (Pg. 848, § B.2,

Art Unit: 2152

¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7), wherein the web content manager allows web content relationship information to be defined, wherein the web content relationship information relates to the web content into an ordered structure (Pg. 845, § A.2, ¶ 1, ln. 1-6; Pg. 845, Fig. 2; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

checking-out a selected file from the electronic content library upon a user's request, wherein the selected file is revised by the user (Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

checking-in an updated version of the selected file to the electronic content library (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

updating the revision history data in the electronic content library in response to the updated version of the selected file being checked-in (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7);

launching a workflow process to notify the web content manager of the updated version of the selected file based on modification to the selected file (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.); and

in response to the notification, publishing the updated version of the selected file using the web content stored in the electronic content library of the enterprise content management system and using the web content relationship information stored by the web

content manager (Pg. 845, § A.2, ¶ 1, ln. 1-6; Pg. 845, Fig. 2; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

Challenger's teachings include tracking pending fragments awaiting publishing as part of a webpage and certain fragments require that a proofreader approve fragments prior to publication (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10). It may be argued that tracking pending fragments to an existing webpage is revision history data. However, Challenger does not appear to explicitly teach this in the embodiment of keeping a history of previous versions of a webpage following updating of the webpage.

However, Official Notice is taken that this is a well-known part of the networking, and specifically web development, field. For example, the Wayback Machine (<http://www.archive.org/web/web.php>) is a service that can be used to display a history of old versions of webpages and to view the webpages. Additionally, logging changes to a webpage is standard practice for many web administrators. This is seen at sites such as Wikipedia.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by using the well known practice of maintaining revision history data for purposes such as allowing a user to display old versions

of a webpage to see changes and to allow a user or administrator to roll back undesired changes to a webpage.

Challenger is silent on the enterprise content management system provides workflow management of workflow processes.

However, Haverstock discloses the enterprise content management system provides workflow management of workflow processes (Abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by having the enterprise content management system provide workflow management of workflow processes as taught by Haverstock in order to enable the automated distribution, routing, and tracking of web documents (Haverstock: Abstract; [0005]).

7. As to claim 38, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

8. As to claim 39, Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 36, including notifying a user authorized to approve changes that the updated version of the selected file has been checked-in to the

Art Unit: 2152

electronic content library (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7).

9. As to claim 40, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 36 above. It may be interpreted that Challenger and what is well known in the art disclose non-web-based data. Proofreaders may reject content proposed for publication to the web (Challenger: Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5.). Additionally, Challenger discloses invoking a website integrity check workflow process that monitors the changed web-based electronic content for errors caused by the change (Page 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-8).

10. As to claim 41, Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose the invention substantially as in the parent claim, including the web-based electronic content comprises computer files containing multimedia data (Challenger: Pg. 850, Fig. 8).

11. As to claim 42, Challenger does not explicitly disclose metadata, but Official Notice (See MPEP 2144.03) is taken that metadata is well known in the networking, and specifically the web development, field as a means of expressing, for example, data about data contained in a webpage, such as topic of interest.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by explicitly disclosing the content comprising files containing metadata as is well known in the art for the purpose of expressing data about data contained in a webpage.

12. As to claim 43, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 41 above.

13. As to claim 44, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above (See the discussion of the inherency versus obviousness, in view of what is well known in the art, for revision history data).

14. As to claims 46-47 and 50, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 36 above (Challenger: Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.).

15. As to claim 48, the claim is rejected for reasons similar to claim 39 above.

16. As to claim 49, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 36 above. The plurality of Trigger Monitors comprises a first content processor for managing the published and non-published electronic content (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 1-5; Pg. 847, § B.1, ¶ 4, ln. 7-10; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 5, ln. 13-14 and 20-21; Pg. 849, Fig. 7) and a second content processor for managing the publication of the published electronic content (Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 3, ln. 1-4; Pg. 848, § B.2, ¶ 8, ln. 3-7; Pg. 849, Fig. 7; Specifically, the Trigger Monitor tracks modification, deletion, and addition; and publishes data to Web Server.) Challenger discloses the second content processor is a web content manager and is linked to the first content processor and is configured to manage information available on a website (Pg. 849, Fig. 7).

17. As to claim 52, Challenger, what is well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 49. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being Internet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that Internet webpages are extremely well known in the art. In fact, they are the standard method for presenting webpages to other users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by publishing webpages to the Internet as is extremely well known in the art, as frequently it is desired to have users across numerous

different networks access a published webpage, for purposes such as dissemination of information and/or advertising.

18. As to claim 53, Challenger, what is well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 15. Challenger appears to be silent on the webpages being intranet webpages. However, Official Notice is taken that intranet webpages are extremely well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger by publishing webpages to an intranet as is extremely well known in the art, for the purpose of limiting webpages to an internal network if information is sensitive, private, or irrelevant to external users.

19. As to claim 54, Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 49, including publishing the changed electronic content on a website; and checking the integrity of the website (Pg. 844, ¶ 7, ln. 5-8).

20. As to claims 55-56, the claims are rejected for reasons similar to claim 48 above.

21. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock as applied to claim 40 above, and further in view of Yuen et al. (Yuen), U.S. Publication No. 2003/0033037 A1.

22. As to claim 45, Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock disclose non-web-based content as discussed above for claim 40. Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock are silent on maintaining access control data in the electronic content library for the electronic content stored therein using enterprise content management system user authorization content.

However, Yuen discloses maintaining access control data in the electronic content library for the electronic content stored therein using enterprise content management system user authorization content (Fig. 7; [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Challenger, what was well known in the art, and Haverstock by including access control data as taught by Yuen in order to ensure that undesirable users are not granted access to files that should be reserved for trusted users.

Conclusion

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571)270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (9:30 AM to 6:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian P. Whipple
/B. P. W./
Examiner, Art Unit 2152
5/3/08

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152